

MR2019-16
Serial Number: 09/492,728
Reply to Office Action dated 11 March 2004

REMARKS

The courtesies extended by the Examiner in granting the 10 June 2004 interview are again appreciatively noted. During the interview, the references used by the Examiner in the Office Action, as well as others presently of record in this Patent Application were discussed in light of further clarifying amendments proposed to the Claims by the undersigned Attorney.

Responsive to the 11 March 2004 Office Action and the discussions had at the interview, each of the pending independent claims, Claims 1, 10, and 14, are hereby amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such further amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the previously-cited Flohr and Narayanaswami references, in view of the newly-cited May, et al. reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Flohr and Narayanaswami do not explicitly recite modification of a shared image. The Examiner, however, cited May, et al. for disclosing such feature and concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Flohr and Narayanaswami combination to incorporate such feature.

The Examiner additionally rejected Claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flohr in view of Narayanaswami and May, et al., in

MR2919-16
Serial Number: 09/492,728
Reply to Office Action dated 11 March 2004

view of the previously-cited FCC 96-193 reference. The Examiner again cited the FCC 96-193 reference for disclosing a particular frequency bandwidth.

Each of Applicant's newly-amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 14 now more clearly recites a system or method directed to communications and data display "for a multi-user meeting." Each newly-amended independent Claim further clarifies among its combination of features a projection system for "displaying a shared image upon a shared screen," as well as at least first and second data appliances operable "independent of the shared screen" to display at least a portion of the shared image thereat. The newly-amended independent Claims each also clarify that, "the first and second data appliances" thereby "provide a capability to simultaneously modify the shared image."

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims is nowhere disclosed by the cited references. The Flohr and Narayanaswami references depart even more clearly from the system and method recited by the claims as further amended, for much the same reasons set forth in Applicant's earlier-submitted Amendment. The newly-cited May, et al. reference does disclose a file-sharing capability. This capability, however, are provided amongst nodes of an established network, which are remotely situated one from the other. Consequently, users at different nodes communicating with one another use and view their own display screens. Though they may share data and information for generating the same display at their respective work stations'

MR2919-16

Serial Number: 09/492,728

Reply to Office Action dated 11 March 2004

display screens, they do not additionally interact with a projection system that displays "a shared image upon a shared screen," as each of the newly-amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 14 now more clearly recites. Indeed, the reference itself speaks in terms of "shared data," explaining that each participating node's "word processing program updates its copy of the shared data," maintained locally at that node's work station (Abstract).


Much like the primarily-cited Flohr reference (directed to a remote video conferencing system), May, et al. is explicitly directed to a system based necessarily on a network of remotely situated nodes. The reference explains unambiguously in this regard that "[b]efore" its node "computers can share a shared data pool for application programs, they need to be connected through the network," (column 10; lines 32-34). The very point of establishing and employing such a computer network is to altogether obviate the need for any "multi-user meeting," for which Applicant's communications and data display system and method are provided (as Claims 1, 10, and 14 now clarify). Like Flohr, then, May, et al. actively precludes such features as a "projection system" for "displaying a shared image upon a shared screen," let alone the use of that system with at least "first and second data appliances each operable independent from the shared screen" to display at least a portion of the shared image, and to "provide a capability to simultaneously modify the shared image," as each of the Claims 1, 10, and 14 also now more clearly recites.

MR2919-16
Serial Number: 09/492,728
Reply to Office Action dated 11 March 2004

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that even when considered together with the May, et al. reference, the previously-cited Flohr, Narayanaswami, and FCC references fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE


Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Date: 6/11/2004


Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit #2614, facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below.

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE


Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262
Dated: 6/11/2004